



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/550,532	09/22/2005	Le T. Duong	21259YP	3180				
210 MERCK AND CO., INC P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907	7590 09/11/2007		<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">HUANG, GIGI GEORGIANA</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		HUANG, GIGI GEORGIANA	
EXAMINER								
HUANG, GIGI GEORGIANA								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>1618</td><td></td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1618		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
1618								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>09/11/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	09/11/2007	PAPER	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
09/11/2007	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/550,532		DUONG ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	GiGi Huang		1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. The Applicant noted in their response on July 20, 2007 that the restriction is traversed and the prior art applied for lack of unity was Gertz et al. WO 95/11029 and the content was not to bisphosphonates and estrogens but to bisphosphonates and growth hormone secretagogues. The Examiner acknowledges that the wrong art was cited in the action but the correct art was Whiteford (WO 94/14455) that was listed in the list of references, a copy of the art was sent to Applicant, the page and line references are to that piece of art. For clarity and the record, the previous restriction is withdrawn and the corrected restriction is set forth below.

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions that are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-6, 27-32 are drawn to the use of an anti-resorptive compound for a disease modifying effect on an arthritic condition.

Group II, claims 7-11 are drawn to the use of an anti-resorptive compound for a disease modifying effect on subchondral bone sclerosis.

Group III, claims 12-16, drawn to the use of an anti-resorptive compound for preventing osteophyte formation or progression in a mammal.

Group IV, claims 17-21, are drawn to the use of an anti-resorptive compound for preventing joint deterioration in a mammal.

Art Unit: 1618

Group V, claims 22-26, drawn to the use of an anti-resorptive compound for inhibiting vascular invasion in calcified cartilage in a mammal.

Group VI, claims 33 is drawn to the use of an anti-resorptive compound with an androgen receptor modulator an osteoclast proton ATPase inhibitor, and HMG-CoA inhibitor, an osteoblast anabolic agent, calcitonin, Vitamin K2 or its salts, or mixtures thereof for a disease modifying effect

The inventions listed as Groups I – VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking Groups I – VI is the use of an anti-resorptive compound.

Whiteford (WO 94/14455) teaches the use of a composition comprising two anti-resorptive compounds, estrogen and bisphosphonates, for the many conditions including osteoarthritis, Paget's disease, osteoporosis, and age –related bone loss. Delivery can be sequentially or as a single composition in many forms including oral, parenteral, and local administration (Page 7, lines 8-35, Page 8, lines 7-35, Page 10, 1-10).

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I – VIII lack novelty and does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Accordingly, Groups I – VIII are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Art Unit: 1618

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement can be traversed (37 CFR 101.43) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

4. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should the applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Art Unit: 1618

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. A telephone call was made to Nicole M. Beeler on May 11, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in further communication and no election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) of the other invention.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Art Unit: 1618

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GiGi Huang whose telephone number is (571) 272-9073. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30AM-6:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GH

8.

